

sullen mood. As recovery finally came and Reagan's "stay the course" was more or less vindicated, his personality and talents as a "Great Communicator" began to sharpen and shape the American and world landscape. He entreated the people of the United States, the country he felt destined to be "a shining city on the hill," to support and further his program and policies. He restored a sometimes teary-eyed patriotism, encouraging Americans to take pride in and celebrate our country, its meaning, and its history. Using his powers as a former actor and the sincerity of his own belief in the goodness of America, whose "morning had just begun," he sought to enlist the people to assist the world along a better path to a brighter future. He returned a pride in military service, severely wounded since the Vietnam war. His own dedication to duty and pride of office restored dignity and world leadership to the presidency.

History may record Reagan as having been extraordinarily lucky to have accomplished his successes at such an advanced age, barely before senility and the eventual ravages of Alzheimer's disease fully took over. D'Souza does not think so. He credits—too much, some will argue—Reagan's ability to cut through the thicket of unimportant matters and take the correct action at nearly every important juncture. Far from being a mere bystander, Reagan led on matters that mattered, even when his decisions were unpopular.

D'Souza notes a nearly mystical aura that President Reagan himself privately acknowledged as governing some of his actions. While many presidents donned the mantra of churchgoing for public consumption, and Reagan himself supported, mainly as a sop to the religious right, a constitutional amendment to allow public school prayer, his own religious beliefs were more complex. Not an active churchgoer before or during his presidency, he apparently firmly believed in an intervening and active higher authority from whom he privately sought solace and guidance. When asked what person he most admired, Reagan invariably answered, "The man from Galilee." Though public ridicule was made of his wife Nancy's seeking guidance from astrologers, without serious objection and perhaps active support from the President, Reagan's truer belief would have been the personally delivered opinion of Mother Theresa that he had been put on this earth for a divine purpose.

This book will not find favor with liberal economists, with those Jeanne Kirkpatrick labeled "Blame America Firsters," or with apologists for the former Soviet communist system who then had advocated accommodation and appeasement, but many of whom now find its demise historically inevitable and Reagan irrelevant. One of D'Souza's obvious purposes in the book is to attack this attempted instant historical revisionism. In so doing, he can fairly be accused of straying too often from a "pure" chronicle of Reagan to a strident attack on his critics. No doubt in anticipated rebuttal, D'Souza points to a "stacked deck" committee chaired by Arthur Schlesinger Jr. and commissioned by the editors of the New York Times in December 1996 to render a collective verdict on how history will rank the U.S. presidents. Not surprisingly these "history experts," which included Doris Kearns Goodwin, James MacGregor Burns, ex-Governor Mario Cuomo, and ex-Senator Paul Simon, liberals all, ranked Reagan in the lower half, below George Bush and in the undistinguished company of Jimmy Carter, Chester Arthur, and Benjamin Harrison. In contrast, D'Souza believes Reagan should be ranked with the Roosevelts, Wilson, Lincoln, and Washington.

Interestingly, however, the ideologically conservative "true believers" who allege that Reagan was merely a popular messenger for an irresistible movement will not be overjoyed with the book. D'Souza paints Reagan as a unique individual, the likes of which are unlikely to return. Though Reagan articulated the principals of the ascending conservative movement, he was flexible rather than rigid, and his sunny personality lent itself to compromise on everything except his hardcore principals. This enabled Reagan to overcome popular reluctance to accept his conservative agenda.

D'Souza describes an apparently simple, but actually a flawed, complex, and contradictory man who accomplished his aims by concentrating on a few specifics that were fundamental to his beliefs. To this reviewer, who was initially extremely skeptical of Reagan's governing capability, let alone his electability to the presidency, but who has come to the happy realization that there really was something in the stars that brought forth this unlikely man to lead our country at such an important time in history, Ronald Reagan gets it exactly right.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PENN- SYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the students, alumni, faculty and administration of The Pennsylvania State University, known more familiarly as Penn State, as the school turns 150 this year.

Established in 1855 as a land grant college, it began modestly as a one-building agriculture school in the center of Pennsylvania. Because there was not even a town there at the time, the town that grew up around the school eventually became incorporated as State College. In testimony to the grit and hardworking tradition of Pennsylvanians, Penn State grew quickly in size as well as academic stature among institutions of higher learning.

Penn State can be proud of its academic tradition. The university boasts a wide array of academic achievements in countless disciplines, from agriculture to engineering, from mathematics to meteorology, from the arts to applied research. Penn State is well-known and respected in national collegiate athletics for the strict academic standards it applies to its athletes. Penn State intercollegiate athletes graduate at a rate significantly above the national average. This sets a national example not only to other collegiate athletes but to college and high school students as well.

I am proud to join my Pennsylvania Colleagues in paying tribute to an institution that has so enriched Pennsylvania and our nation academically and culturally.

CONGRATULATING MRS. FRANCES
HARRIETT COBB HART ON HER
75TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and pleasure I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mrs. Frances Harriett Cobb Hart on her 75th Birthday. Mrs. Hart, a native Floridian, has given much of her life to serving her family, church, community, and nation. She is truly an exemplary American.

Born on June 28, 1929, Mrs. Hart was born to Charles Ernest Cobb and Mary Elliott Cobb. As the daughter of citrus growers, Mrs. Hart spent much of her early life becoming acquainted with Florida's rich agricultural tradition. Not limited simply to citrus farming, Mrs. Hart's family raised both cattle and horses in a rural community once known as Cobb's Landing.

After graduating from Wesleyan College in Macon, Georgia, Mrs. Hart married Methodist Pastor James Wynne Hart. Choosing to leave her Florida roots behind, Mr. and Mrs. Hart have spent much of their adult lives between the hills and mountains of East Tennessee and Western Carolina.

An extremely active woman, Mrs. Hart was an avid athlete in her youth, often partaking in such physically strenuous activities as the amateur rodeo. In her maturity, Mrs. Hart has spent much of her time as a church historian and artisan. Throughout her life Frances has been an active member of her community, both willingly and unselfishly serving those around her.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Mrs. Frances Hart's birthday we also celebrate her legacy as a wife, mother, and community volunteer. For her endless contributions and uncompromising devotion to her family and community we are proud to honor Mrs. Frances Harriett Cobb Hart on her 75th birthday. Let us rise today to honor this great woman of strength, character, and moral standing.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOP- MENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 2004

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4614) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes:

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address serious problems with this bill and particularly with its Report, which cannot be fully remedied by the amendment I propose.

The problem is not so much with the bill, which we have before us, but with the directive report language that goes along with it.

As members, we rarely focus on report language and our vote in favor of the bill does

not approve the report language. Usually, report language tracks the provisions of the bill. In the case of this appropriations measure, the report language goes far beyond the authority of the appropriations committee, directly contradicts recorded votes taken by this House, and is inconsistent with the FY05 Defense Authorization Act which the House has passed.

I will vote for this Bill, which in itself generally provides funds necessary for Department of Energy to execute its important responsibilities in scientific research, energy, and national security. In fact, I applaud its increase in research funding for the Office of Science.

But with my "yes" vote today, I also feel compelled to speak in favor of the majority in this House and put in the record our well documented objection to a number of directions to the Department of Energy in the accompanying Report.

The Report language seeks to undermine initiatives supported by recorded votes in the Defense Authorization bill for the past two years, supported by votes on the House floor for two years, and sustained in the other body for two years. These initiatives have been advocated by the House majority in a policy statement; have been supported and requested by the Department of Defense and the Defense Science Board; and have been a sustained part of this Administration's development of a strategic forces policy for the 21st century consistent with reducing our nuclear forces to the lowest levels possible.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that Committee Staff sometimes overreach in reports, and I would bet a dozen Krispy Kreme Donuts that fewer than half a dozen members of this House are even aware of what has been included in the report accompanying this bill in very prescriptive terms. But this report seeks to give legitimacy to policy positions directly contravened by recorded votes in this House and we cannot allow there to be any confusion about where we stand.

The Bill appropriates \$6,514,424,000 for Weapon Activities. The Report seeks to give the appearance that the House has limited funding for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. But we have not. We will vote today to spend those funds and we voted in the FY05 Authorization bill on May 20th of this year to authorize \$6,577,953,000, including \$27.6M for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator study, approving that bill by a vote of 391–34. An amendment to explicitly remove authorization for this study failed on that same day by a vote of 214–204.

The Report seeks to give the appearance that we would like to restrict Laboratory Directed Research and Development at Department of Energy Laboratories. But we have not. We will vote today to fund out laboratories. Only the House Armed Services Committee can pass legislation to limit the LDRD program. On May 20 we passed the FY05 Defense Authorization Act that continued the previously authorized LDRD program at our laboratories.

After September 11, 2001, we were grateful that those Laboratories had been doing this kind of exploratory research under the LDRD program. The fact they have done so has helped secure our homeland and aid our troops in the field. To chill such research would be unwise.

Further, the Report would have you believe that we are voting to restructure the future

LDRD program. But we have not. This bill does not change the LDRD program in any way.

Further, the Report language would have you believe that we are voting to have the NNSA focus solely on its missions of life extension of the existing stockpile and the current stockpile stewardship program. But we are not. The bill does nothing of the sort. In fact, if we were to pay any attention to the report language, we would be threatening those priorities. The Report suggests that we make major reductions in one Life Extension Program unsupported by an assessment of the impact and risks this would imply. It would also require a higher priority for dismantlement activities in a way that will likely come at the expense of meeting current Life Extension milestones for the Department of Defense. It would make significant reductions to numerous areas of the stockpile stewardship program that were designed by the NNSA to address technical needs to assess with adequately small uncertainty the safety, reliability, and performance of our weapons without nuclear tests.

None of this makes any sense and the report language would not stand up to any serious review by elected Members of Congress.

The Report suggests that by voting for this bill we are changing the way NNSA operates with other entities within the DOE. But it does not. The report suggests that we are adding a burdensome procedure for approval of NNSA activities at the request of, other elements of the DOE, and would hold hostage numerous unique activities of the NNSA labs within these energy and science programs.

The Report would suggest that we are approving a review of future requirements for the weapons complex development plan, to be conducted only by people with no experience in doing that work. That would be silly and the bill includes no such thing.

The reason we cannot vote to amend report language under the rules of the House is because report language is not law and does not have the authority of law. The law we are voting on is in the bill before us. In most cases, report language explains and supports the bill.

In this case, those writing the report went far beyond any reasonable authority as staff members and I think we need to make it clear that the measures included in the Report are inconsistent with statute, inconsistent with the FY05 Defense Authorization Act, inconsistent with recorded votes taken by this House and have no force or authority whatsoever. An error of this magnitude must be jettisoned in the conference committee so that agencies affected are not confused by the mixed messages sent here.

Mr. Chairman, the problems in this Report are many. I felt it important to clarify for the record that members of the House are approving the text of the Bill. We do not approve of the Report language, which is replete with practical problems and inconsistent with the law.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS #2055 RECOGNITION

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post #2055. Every year the third weekend in September is set aside as National Prisoners of War and Missing in Action Day. For the last six years, the Ladies Auxiliary of VFW Post #2055 has honored the 196 soldiers from Illinois that are considered to be a prisoner of war or missing in action. I join the Ladies Auxiliary in honoring these brave individuals.

As well, I commend the auxiliary for their efforts to honor these men and their families. May God bless not only these 196 that will be honored by VFW Post #2055 but also those serving today. May God continue to bless America.

ENCOURAGING CONGRESS TO CONTINUE TO FUND INTERNATIONAL CREDIT UNION DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, more than 85 million Americans are familiar with the benefits offered by credit unions of a safe place to save, a place to get a good deal on a consumer or home mortgage loan and solid advice on how to manage their families' financial affairs. However, not everyone in the world has the same advantage of being able to choose to save and borrow at a credit union as we do here in the U.S. The World Council of Credit Unions is working on USAID-funded projects on six continents to develop and strengthen credit unions in ten countries. Current development projects have already resulted in nearly three million credit union members who have saved \$1.6 billion and received affordable loans up to \$1.3 billion in a number of developing countries such as the Philippines, Romania, Ecuador, Guatemala, Poland, Uganda, Rwanda, Uzbekistan and Mexico.

I met recently with representatives from Mexico's two largest credit unions, Caja Popular Mexicana and Caja Libertad, men who spoke with me about how the World Council of Credit Unions, with funds from USAID and U.S. credit unions, has helped more than a million of Mexico's poorest citizens through access to the benefits of credit unions.

The World Council of Credit Unions, as part of the credit union system that includes the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) in the U.S. and its affiliated state credit union leagues, is working in partnership to close the gap between people of the world that "have more" with those who "have less." Today, 1.1 billion people on the planet "have more" and 5.2 billion "have less." By 2050, projections indicate that while the "have more" number will remain constant, those "having less" will rise to 7.8 billion people. This widening gap represents a security risk to the U.S. Credit unions can help alleviate this crisis.